

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, OCTOBER, 1909

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Oregon, Washington, and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, 24 Concord Avenue, Cambridge.

Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women

Thirty-five Branch Committees; 14,549 members in 263 cities, towns, and villages.*

MRS. G. HOWLAND SHAW, President.

MRS. J. RANDOLPH COOLIDGE,

MISS ANNA L. DAWES,

MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD,

MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS,

MISS AGNES IRWIN,

MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer,

Walnut Street, Brookline.

MISS ELIZABETH JOHNSON, Rec. Sec'y.

MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y,
24 Concord Avenue, Cambridge.

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations and removals from the State.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN SUFFRAGETTES.

THE English suffragette breaks up public meetings and private functions, tries to "rush" Parliament, slaps the faces of policemen, throws stones at windows, and, when put in prison for these offences defies the prison regulations.

The American suffragette plays hurdygurdies in Wall street, shrieks suffrage arguments from the surf to the crowds at Nantasket beach, and circulates absurd pledges against marrying men who will not promise lifelong support to the suffrage cause.

There is something to choose between the two, and thus far, the English suffragette is noisier, more violent and more objectionable than her American imitator. But there has been, of late, so large an infusion

of hysterics in American suffrage propaganda, and so apparent a determination to copy the English methods that it would seem to be about time for the more sane of the American suffrage leaders to reflect upon the probable consequences of such demonstrations.

Last winter the Massachusetts suffrage leaders organized a demonstration in and about the State House, copying some of the English methods and enlisting the cooperation of two young English suffragettes. The demonstration was intended to produce an effect upon the legislature. Undoubtedly it did so, for when the vote was taken, it resulted in the heaviest majority against a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution which had been recorded for fifty years.

American women who oppose woman suffrage might well look with composure upon the adoption of suffragette methods, knowing that they are certain to injure rather than advance the cause in behalf of which they are undertaken. But merely as women, without regard to their attitude toward this question, they cannot but deplore these excesses. Whether these demonstrations are prompted by mistaken zeal, or by hysterical excitement or by a craving for notoriety or by all combined, they are discreditable to American womanhood.

DR. HALE AND WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

It is a fact worthy of notice that, broad as were the late Rev. Dr. Edward Everett Hale's sympathies, and unflagging as were his exertions for the relief of the oppressed and the elevation of humanity, he had no patience with the demand for woman suffrage. Ten years ago, he wrote:

"I am now asked to confer responsibility of suffrage upon women. This means, of course, that they are willing to accept all the responsibilities of public-spirited men. To which request I reply that I do not think that they want to do these things, and second, that I do not think that they would do them well."

It has been intimated that Dr. Hale must have changed his opinion within ten years. Inquired of by a friend upon this matter last year, Dr. Hale replied:

"Forty years ago I said that Woman Suffrage was the greatest humbug of the age, and I have thought so every minute since."

THE ENGLISH REMONSTRANTS.

THE strength of the English Remonstrant movement is well measured by the petition against woman suffrage which the Women's National Anti-Suffrage League presented to the House of Commons last March. That petition, as it passed the Petition Office of the government, contained 254,620 officially-verified signatures.

English suffragists have been boasting for a dozen years of their great petition of 1896. That was not strictly a petition. It was not presented to Parliament, and it did not pass the scrutiny of the Petition Office. It was merely a collection of names, gathered in different constituencies in books, with no precautions against fraud or duplication.

Yet, gathered in this careless and irresponsible way, the whole number of reported signatures to this suffrage petition was only 257,000, or about 2,500 more than the officially-verified signatures to the anti-suffrage petition, which the Remonstrants secured in five months, without organized canvassing.

There can be no doubt that, in England as in the United States, the Remonstrants represent an enormous majority of women.

WOMEN DO NOT WANT TO VOTE.

To a symposium in the Boston Globe of August 22, upon the question "Why do so few women avail themselves of the school suffrage?" Mrs. Charles P. Strong, corresponding secretary of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women, made the following contribution:

Plainly it is the suffragists who should answer the question, "Why do so few women avail themselves of the school suffrage?" The suffragists insist that women want the ballot and that they ought to have it. Confronted with the fact that often not more than 1 or 2 percent, and rarely more than 4 percent of the women who are entitled to exercise the school suffrage actually do so, the suffragists ought to find some explanation which is consistent with their demand.

Doubtless they will say now, as they have said many times before, that there is nothing, under ordinary conditions, in school suffrage to arouse the interest of women. Often the nominations for school committee are agreed upon by opposing political parties, and there is no real contest over their election. But school suffrage is not to be regarded by itself, but as the opening to larger privileges. If the masses of women, if even a considerable minority of women, wanted a more extended use of the ballot, would they not use eagerly the ballot which they have as an expression of their desire for more?

The suffragists themselves appreciate this, although it is inconvenient for them openly to acknowledge it. This is the real basis of the frenzied but futile appeals which they annually make to women to vote for school committee. It is not that they want any particular candidates elected or any particular issues carried, but that they want the largest possible women's vote polled. When elections approach they do not hesitate to make a direct appeal on this ground; but they shrink from accepting or admitting the logical conclusion from the meagre vote of women.

Fourteen years ago the women of Massachusetts were invited by the legislature to express their opinion upon the desirability of extending the full municipal ballot to women. Women of voting age were given the

freest opportunity to vote. It cannot be said that this was an unimportant question. A large and enthusiastic affirmative vote by women would very probably have been followed by the grant of municipal suffrage by the legislature, and this, perhaps, by still larger extensions of the privilege. So confident of the result were the suffragists that, shortly before the election, their newspaper organ predicted that, after the vote was taken, the suffragists might claim to speak for the majority of Massachusetts women. But what happened? The affirmative vote of women was but little if any larger than the vote annually cast by women for school committee.

This would seem to prove that the women who vote for school committee, totalling somewhere from 2 to 4 percent of the women of voting age, embrace practically all the women of the state who want any form of suffrage. Even from this total, some deductions must be made for women who, while they do not want the suffrage, feel it a duty to exercise it, more or less, in school matters, but do so reluctantly and under protest.

The true answer, therefore, to this question is that the reason why so few women avail themselves of school suffrage is that an enormous majority of Massachusetts women do not want the ballot in any form.

ANTI-SUFFRAGE ACTIVITY.

ACCORDING to the New York Tribune of July 22, the summer was a busy one with the anti-suffragists of that city. The National League for the Civic Education of Women, of which Mrs. Gilbert Jones is chairman, was engaged in sending out literature and in arranging another lecture course for next winter. The new anti-suffrage committee of the City Federation of Women's Clubs, under the chairmanship of Mrs. Julian Heath, held regular meetings during the summer, and expected, by the time the federation holds its fall meeting, to have on its roll a representative of every affiliated club except those of avowedly suffrage convictions. It was occupied also in preparing a report for the fall convention.

THE NEW LEADERSHIP.

MRS. OLIVER H. P. BELMONT, of New York and Newport, has come rather suddenly to the front as a leader of American suffragists. She has furnished a good deal of material to the newspapers and is financing the suffrage movement generously. Her activity and the prominence accorded her among the suffragists lend special interest to her views. As first communicated in an interview with Miss Nixola Greeley-Smith for the San Francisco Bulletin of June 22d, and later as widely printed as an article by itself in hundreds of American newspapers, they are as given below. If they are incorrectly reported in any particular, THE REMONSTRANCE will print any authorized correction of them.

I have been in favor of woman suffrage all my life. I do not understand how any woman who respects herself and other women can feel otherwise. Have you ever been through a Turkish harem? Those poor, timid, ignorant creatures want nothing better than what they have. The point of view of the anti-suffragist is little better than that of the harem.

Personally I do not need the suffrage. I would of course regard the right to vote as an honor and a dignity. I believe it is the duty of every woman who has leisure and wealth to work for the ballot for other women who will never get justice without it.

Men will never give suffrage to women of their own accord. Why should they? It is their last stronghold. Year after year women have been going up, up, and men have been going down.

There is, of course, one way in which women could get the ballot all over the world in eighteen months, but they haven't the courage to attempt it. They would be too much afraid of losing their chances of that precious thing, a husband, which, unfortunately, they have been taught to prize.

That way would be for every woman to take an oath not to marry until woman suffrage was granted.

As it is I think every woman suffragist should pledge herself not to marry out of the cause, just as every member of the Salvation Army

has to take an oath not to marry out of the army.

I think that if most women over 18 told the truth they would say that they hate men. But, of course, under the present unjust and unequal conditions they conceal their feelings. How many wives would dare to tell their husbands what they really think of them? How long would the husbands live with them if they did?

WORKING WOMEN AND THE BALLOT.

DISCUSSING the argument that the ballot is needed by the working woman as an indispensable agency for raising her economic status to a level with that of the working man, and that women of wealth and leisure ought to support the suffragist movement as an act of self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of the poor working girl, "The Social Settler" in the Boston Transcript remarks:

This argument is sheer clap-trap. The lack of the ballot has nothing whatever to do with the fact that women workers are paid less than men in the same occupations; the grant of the ballot would not raise the rate of women's wages to an equality with that of men's. The comparatively low pay of women is due to economic and social causes which the voting power could not affect in the slightest degree. Briefly put, the chief of these causes are: 1. The lower efficiency of the average woman worker, resulting mainly from physical limitations; 2. The temporary nature of the employment, which in most cases is terminated by marriage; 3. The rapid increase of the supply of woman labor, which in recent decades has been crowding into occupations already filled by men; 4. The lack of organization, which has left women at the mercy of sweat-masters; 5. The parasitic relation of many women toward their industrial occupations, which are not their sole means of support. These causes would persist even if women had the ballot. Whatever the suffrage would or would not do for woman, it would assuredly not bring her equality of pay with man.

Nor would the ballot assist working women to obtain better legislative protection against injurious conditions of employment. On the con-

trary, much of the present legislation limiting the hours and regulating the terms of employment for women would be rendered unconstitutional by the proposed extension of the suffrage. This legislation, so far as it applies to adult women, now stands the test of constitutionality only because women are in the same class with minors as regards their constitutional status. If women were given the ballot and thus were placed in the same class with adult men, they would be deprived of the special protection now afforded them by the labor code. In this respect the working woman would be worse off with the ballot than she is without the boomerang "weapon."

AN AMERICAN "MILITANT."

(From the Boston Transcript, August 26, 1909.)

NEW YORK, Aug. 26—Bayonne, N. J., has a militant suffragette who lives up to the name.

"No great cause was ever won without bloodshed," said Mrs. Julia Goldzier. "If the Legislature will not grant us the right to vote, the women should arm themselves, march to the capitol at Trenton and surround the building when the law makers are in executive session. Then give them the alternative of granting us the right of suffrage or being shot down. I guess they would choose the easier course. If not, let them suffer the consequences and the world would see then that we really meant business." Mrs. Goldzier recently asked the city council to appoint women to the police force. She says she is willing to lead the siege of the State capitol herself.

THE SUFFRAGITIS IN DENMARK.

(From The New York Evening Post, August 19, 1909)

COPENHAGEN, August 19.—The Folkething, which met for the first time to-day since the formation of the new ministry, were treated to a lively overture by Mlle. Westenholz, a suffragist, whose activity in the cause has brought her into prominence on several previous occasions. Forcing her way past the attendants and doorkeepers of the Chamber, the woman planted herself in front of the president's chair and gave the Deputies a trouncing.

"Here you sit," she cried out, "you

Danish men, haggling selfishly in a lust of power over the weal and woe of the country. But the women of Denmark, I tell you, disown you and brand you as a lot of hirelings, belonging to no country, who betray the honor of Denmark."

The bell of the president and a fire of interruptions from the Deputies had no effect on Mlle. Westenholz, who concluded her speech before the attendants seized her and removed her from the Chamber.

THE RESORT TO PHYSICAL VIOLENCE.

(From the Springfield Republican, July 15, 1909.)

It is possible that the London magistrate who lectured so severely the suffragets who had thrown stones at the windows of the Parliament building, punched the heads of policemen and in divers ways disturbed the peace, was fresh from contemplating the case of the young Hindu who had assassinated Col. Sir William Wylie. The suffragets justified their crimes as "political offences" perpetrated for purely political ends. But the Hindu justifies murder on exactly the same grounds. When brought before the court, on Saturday last, the assassin of Col. Wylie showed convincingly that he had acted wholly for political ends, and, in his own view, he had at the worst committed a political offence. "I maintain," he said, "that if it is patriotic for Englishmen to fight against the Germans, if they occupy this country, then it is much more justifiable and patriotic in my case to fight against the English. I hold that the English people are responsible for the murder of 80,000,000 of my countrymen during the last 50 years, and that they are also responsible for the taking from India of \$500,000,000 every year." The difference between the Hindu's defense of assassination and the suffragets' defense of window breaking and street rioting is, logically, one of degree only. Both resort to physical violence. Murder is simply the tactics of physical violence, in a political cause pushed to the utmost length. With assassination occurring in London, it is possible that the magistrates, and perhaps the government, are becoming somewhat impatient with those who are following the teachings of the physical violence school, even in the most refined form.

A SPECIMEN SUFFRAGETTE "DEMONSTRATION"

THE New York Times of September 19 printed an account, from its special London correspondent, of an attack recently made by three suffragettes upon Mr. Asquith, the Premier, and Mr. Herbert Gladstone.

Mr. Asquith and Mr. Gladstone were spending the week end at Lympne Castle, near Hythe. As they were leaving church after the Sunday morning service, they were rushed at by three women, one of whom struck the Premier repeatedly. Later, the attack was renewed, when the two Ministers entered a golf club house. The Times prints Mr. Asquith's account of the incident; but, as American suffragists are in the habit of charging that such occurrences are exaggerated by a hostile press, THE REMONSTRANCE prefers to give the story as told by one of the suffragette trio, Miss Kenny:

"We stationed ourselves near the entrance to the club-house on the golf course and waited until the golfers began to leave. Almost the last to go were Mr. Asquith and Mr. Gladstone and some other men. The place was almost deserted and everything was quiet. The sun was setting; it was the time when people were just beginning to think about dinner. The Prime Minister's party approached the clubhouse and we saw Mr. Asquith's motor car drive around to the entrance.

Undetected we stood close to the clubhouse, and as the Prime Minister was descending the steps one of us sprang forward and caught hold of his arm. He turned and simply ran up the steps, and we ran after him. It was quite a chase, and as he reached the top step one of my companions caught him in the doorway. He tried to push her away, but she was too quick for him and caught hold of his collar. Then a real fight ensued. Mr. Asquith called Mr. Gladstone, who came rushing out.

It was a real old jostle. There they were, trying to push us out, and we were endeavoring to get in. Blows were struck and Mr. Gladstone fought like a pugilist. It got more serious; Mr. Gladstone lunged out and we lunged out, for we were

determined not to be pushed down the steps by them.

I don't think the Prime Minister received any bruises, but Miss Howie's arm was scratched. We all came down the steps somehow, and by this time we women were out of breath. A man held us, and Mr. Asquith and Mr. Gladstone entered their car and drove away. Before they went I shouted out to Mr. Asquith: 'Worse will happen to you unless you stop heaping these indignities on women.'

Even this was not all. That evening, at ten o'clock, Mr. and Mrs. Asquith were sitting in the dining room with their guests, when two large stones were thrown through one of the windows, and several women who were outside ran away, leaving behind a bag containing a rope. This incident also is described by Miss Kenny as follows:

"We helped each other up, and we had a lot of slips and scrambles, falls and tumbles. At last we reached to within a short distance of two open windows, from which light streamed. We judged by the sounds of the table furniture that the party were at dinner, but I cannot say whether Mr. Gladstone was there. We did not listen to the talking, because we would do nothing dishonorable—we simply went about our work at once.

"One of us was hoisted up to a window and peeped through and saw them at dinner. She reported her observations, and, standing on the wall, we decided upon our plan of action. Up again we hoisted her, and, thrusting her head through the window, she cried: 'Mr. Asquith, we shall go on pestering you until you give women the vote.' And then the window was smashed with stones.

"How we got down off the wall and scrambled over the fences and through the ditches I don't know. We heard a commotion behind us in the castle, and a man's voice on the terrace cried out, 'There they go, down the steps.' We got quietly into our boat and looked behind us. The glare of lanterns, yellow, red, and green, flashed about the castle grounds, and voices called. But they never thought of casting the light on the canal or looking for us there. And so we got away."

The fine delicacy which kept these women from listening, because that

would have been "dishonorable" but did not prevent them from assaulting the Premier, or from throwing stones through the windows of the room in which he was entertaining his guests cannot be too highly admired.

MAKING A JEST OF SUFFRAGE.

THE Connecticut legislature continues to exhibit a disinclination to take woman suffrage proposals seriously. At the session this year, which was protracted until August, the House passed a bill conferring license suffrage upon women, but the Senate rejected it. On the other hand, after the House had voted to postpone indefinitely a municipal suffrage bill the Senate passed it by a vote of 20 to 5. Neither branch reconsidered its action, so both bills were killed. If both houses had acted sincerely on their convictions, both proposals would have been promptly killed on the first vote, and the feelings of the suffragists would have been spared.

THE "MILITANT" SUFFRAGISTS

(From the Congregationalist, July 31, 1909.)

ENGLISH women have now for more than a year been carrying on a campaign for woman's suffrage by methods which they call "militant." Well-dressed, well-bred and hitherto respectable women violate the laws to attract attention, strike and bite policemen who arrest them, glory in going to prison, where they refuse to eat and, as elsewhere, behave disorderly, presuming on their sex as a protection against severe punishment. If they should succeed in getting the privilege of voting, what freshness and vigor they would infuse into politics! Mrs. Sarah Grand, the well-known novelist, herself a suffragist, remarks in the London Chronicle that the movement, which had begun with brilliant effect, has degenerated into nagging and become a bore. "Women lost to all sense of dignity and decency are covering us with shame and confusion by conduct which proves nothing except that they do not see themselves as others see them."